

Attached is an updated , project by project status report, and a background report provided to Council last spring.

No camera use data is available for City owned cameras in the City parking garage or those not monitored by UMPD. To the best of my recollection, since police investigation review requests normally are routed through me, there have been no more than six (6) requests for video review for these cameras over the past 2 years. Public Services will begin to keep stats on these requests.

Also attached is a report of notable incidents where security cameras were used by UMPD. Following is statistical data provided by UMPD for the City owned cameras they monitor.

There are two different categories that these stats cover. The first table covers specific video review requests which require UMPD staff to investigate an incident that previously occurred; so the number means that at least one City camera was used during 240 separate requests for video. This does not take into consideration UMPD Security Operations Center (SOC) monitor reports. The next table covers those.

The second table covers UMPD use of City cameras during an active incident, such as a traffic stop; theft report; B&E; fight; etc. This is recorded under viewable and not viewable reports. For example, in 1Q'15, UMPD monitors utilized City cameras in 591 viewable and not viewable reports; not viewable implies that the City camera was the closest to the incident without being able to see the location.

- 1) While it is possible for UMPD to access the number of times City cameras were utilized in review and during an active incident, specific case dispositions are not shown in this data.
- 2) For SOC monitor reports, it would require someone to specifically open each report and read them for dispositions. This is only done for police investigators for specific investigations or cases resulting in an arrest. For video reviews, UMPD statistics record that it aided an investigation (non-specific) or resulted in a direct arrest while the incident was active(ALPR hits, use of forces, emergency reviews, etc.). UMPD does not record the disposition of a case in camera statistics once the officer utilizes it for their investigation.
- 3) Usually these stats show cases which required cameras to be accessed by UMPD monitors to view an incident. At other times, cameras were accessed during self-initiated reports (SOC monitors located an incident resulting in police/ems dispatch), or during a video review where suspect/victim information was captured by City cameras.

The below example has been simplified to represent total video review requests SOC has received in comparison to the total reviews utilizing City cameras.

The % column = Count / Total Reviews Submitted. For example, 17% (131/771) of our reviews, in YTD'15, utilized a City camera. Under 'YTD Change', 'Raw Count' represents the basic +/- values across YTD counts; 'Non-Proportional % Change'  $[(YTD'15 \text{ Count} - YTD'14 \text{ Count}) / YTD'14 \text{ Count}]$  evaluates the basic +/- percentage across years. In other words, without taking into consideration the total number of reviews, there was a 20%  $[(131-109)/109]$  non-proportional increase in reviews utilizing City cameras. 'Yearly % Change'  $[(YTD'15 \text{ % Column} - YTD'14 \text{ % Column}) / YTD'14 \text{ % Column}]$  evaluates proportional change; so in comparison to total reviews submitted across the 2 years there was only a 4% actual increase in reviews utilizing City cameras.

These tables (YTD and 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter) cover our review stats and not our SOC monitor reports.

YTD

	2014		2015		YTD Combined Totals (Count)	YTD Change		
	Count	%	Count	%		Raw Count	Non-Proportional % Change*	Yearly % Change
<b>Total Reviews Submitted</b>	670	N/A	771	N/A	<b>1441</b>	<b>101</b>	N/A	<b>15%</b>
<b>PGPD External Reviews</b>	35	5%	42	5%	<b>77</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>Reviews Utilizing City Cameras</b>	109	16%	131	17%	<b>240</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>4%</b>

1<sup>st</sup> Quarter

	Jan 1 - Mar 31, 2015		Jan 1 - Mar 31, 2016		Quarter's Combined Total (Count)	Quarterly Change		
	Count	%	Count	%		Raw Count*	Non-Proportional % Change*	Quarterly % Change*
<b>Total Reviews Submitted</b>	131	N/A	133	N/A	<b>264</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>PGPD External Reviews</b>	7	5%	17	13%	<b>24</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>143%</b>	<b>139%</b>
<b>Reviews Utilizing City Cameras</b>	21	16%	33	25%	<b>54</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>55%</b>

This table solely covers the reports that were written by our SOC monitors and which also utilize City cameras. It does not pertain to the video reviews being requested by UMPD or external agencies. The columns are calculated similarly to the ones above. Additionally, the spreadsheets should have the equations in them as reference, if not let me know and I can update.

What does the data mean: SOC monitors submitted 28 work orders for City cameras in 1Q'15, representing 12% of total work orders in that year; overall, 12% (591/4,764) of the reports written in the same quarter, by our monitors, utilized a City camera. Between 1Q'14 and 1Q'15, denoted under '1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Change: City of College Park Cameras', there was a 10% actual increase in total reports written.

**SOC City Comparison Information 1Q'14-1Q'15**

SOC City Comparison Information 1Q'14-1Q'15											1st Quarter Change	City of College Park Cameras			
1Q '14 (JAN 1 - MAR 31)	City of College Park Cameras		UMPD Cameras		2014 Combined City & UMPD	1Q '15 (JAN 1 - MAR 31)	City of College Park Cameras		UMPD Cameras		2015 Combined City & UMPD	Count	Non-Proportional % Change	% Change	
	Count	%	Count	%	Total		Count	%	Count	%	Total				
<b>Cameras*</b>	22	6%	334	94%	<b>356</b>	<b>Cameras*</b>	22	6%	334	94%	<b>356</b>	<b>Cameras</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Work Orders</b>	20	10%	173	90%	<b>193</b>	<b>Work Orders</b>	28	12%	208	88%	<b>236</b>	<b>Work Orders</b>	8	40%	14%
<b>Viewable</b>	479	11%	3,749	89%	<b>4,228</b>	<b>Viewable</b>	468	12%	3,389	88%	<b>3,857</b>	<b>Viewable</b>	-11	-2%	7%
<b>Not Viewable</b>	107	11%	864	89%	<b>971</b>	<b>Not Viewable</b>	123	14%	784	86%	<b>907</b>	<b>Not Viewable</b>	16	15%	23%
<b>Total Reports</b>	586	11%	4,613	89%	<b>5,199</b>	<b>Total Reports</b>	591	12%	4,173	88%	<b>4,764</b>	<b>Total Reports</b>	5	1%	10%
<b>ALPR Hits</b>	N/A**	N/A**	552	100%	<b>552</b>	<b>ALPR Hits</b>	N/A**	N/A**	526	100%	<b>526</b>	<b>ALPR Hits</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A

If this data is useful to the Council , we will ask for additional time periods. Also note that a review of the effectiveness of our security camera installations is included in the Public Safety / Police Services Study for which we have issued an RFP. We will forward any Council questions regarding our security cameras to the selected consultant for inclusion in their study.

Bob Ryan  
 Director  
 Public Services  
 City of College Park  
 240-487-3570